

**REMARKS**

Claims 134-150, 152-159, 162-168, and 170-178 are pending in this Application, with claims 134, 145, 149, 157, 166, and 175-178 being independent.

***Claim Objections***


Claim 169 was objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicants have cancelled claim 169 without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claim 169.

***Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)*****Claims 134, 149, and 157 are Patentable over the *Kelley et al.* Article**

Claims 134, 136-138, 140-142, 149, 153-159 and 162-165 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kelley et al. "MagicMouse: Tactile and Kinesthetic Feedback in the Human-Computer Interface using an Electromagnetically Actuated Input/Output Device" (hereafter "the *Kelley* article.")

**Independent Claim 134 and its Dependent Claims**

Independent claim 134 recites "the second force feedback being one of a vibrational force feedback and a texture force feedback." As indicated by the Examiner with respect to allowed claim 139, the *Kelley* article fails to disclose or suggest "the second force feedback being one of a vibrational force feedback and a texture force feedback." Subject matter from claim 139 is now recited in independent claim 134. For at least this reason, independent claim 134 is allowable over the cited reference. Based at least on their dependence on independent claim 134, dependent claims 136-138 and 140-142 are allowable.



Independent Claim 149 and its Dependent Claims

Independent claim 149 recites “sensation parameters including a duration parameter, a magnitude parameter, and a frequency parameter.” As stated by the Examiner with respect to allowed claim 166, the *Kelley* article fails to disclose or suggest “sensation parameters including a duration parameter, a magnitude parameter, and a frequency parameter” as now recited by independent claim 149. For at least this reason, independent claim 149 is allowable over the cited reference. Based at least on their dependence upon independent claim 149, dependent claims 153-156 are also allowable.

Independent Claim 157 and its Dependent Claims

Independent claim 157 recites “the first force feedback being one of a vibrational force feedback and a texture force feedback.” As stated by the Examiner with respect to allowed claim 134, the *Kelley* article fails to disclose or suggest “the first force feedback being one of a vibrational force feedback and a texture force feedback,” as now recited by independent claim 157. Based at least on their dependence upon independent claim 157, dependent claims 158-159 and 162-165 are also allowable.

New Claims 176-178 are Allowable

Claim 176 recites “generating a third force feedback based on movement of the cursor within the boundary of the target, the third force feedback being a different type from the first force feedback and the second force feedback.” Claim 177 recites “generating a third force feedback when the cursor is moved from a position inside the boundary of the target to a position outside the boundary of the target after the signal associated with the selection of the target is received, the third force feedback being of a different type of force feedback than the first force feedback and the second force feedback.” Claim 178 recites “determining if a signal associated with a

D

selection of the target has been received [] discontinuing the generating of the second force feedback when the target has been selected.”

The subject matter of new claims 176-178 is allowable over the cited references.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in the application.

***Comments on Statement of Reasons for Indication of Allowable Subject Matter***

A statement of reasons for indication of allowable subject matter was set forth in the Office Action.

While the Applicants agree that the pending claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth in the Examiner's statement, the Applicants submit that the invention as recited by the claims and as described in the present application is patentable over the art of record for reasons in addition to those listed in the Examiner's statement. For example, Applicants note that the Examiner's statement paraphrases various elements of the allowed independent claims. Applicants note that the language of the claims as allowed defines the invention and the language in the Examiner's statement should not be construed as limiting the claims in any manner. Moreover, the claims contain recitations in addition to those stated by the Examiner that provide additional bases for patentability over the art of record. Accordingly, the Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims of different scope than those in the present application. For example, such claims may not necessarily need to include the elements identified in the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance in the present application.

**CONCLUSION**

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections, and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that further personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.


Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Dated: January 16, 2004

Cooley Godward LLP  
ATTN: Patent Group  
One Freedom Square  
Reston Town Center  
11951 Freedom Drive  
Reston, VA 20190-5656  
Tel: (703) 456-8000  
Fax: (703) 456-8100

Respectfully submitted,  
COOLEY GODWARD LLP

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Erik B. Milch  
Reg. No. 42,887